UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,985	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavarpu	5181-46200	7125

7590 03/31/2003

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER	
DINH, KHANH Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	7

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/552,985	Allavarpu et al
Examiner	**Art Unit**
Khanh Dinh	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *THREE* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Feb 12, 2002* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). *6*
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 2/12/2002 (paper # 6) fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3, 6, 24, and 29 are objected because of the abbreviation of ASN1, IIOP. The applicant has to recite the complete name of ASN1, IIOP in the claims.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 5, 7, -10, 13-16, 18-21, 26, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg et al US pat. No.6,496,833.

As to claim 1, Goldberg discloses a method for managing a network, the method comprising:

a client (102 fig.1) generating a request for type information for an attribute or event, wherein the request is expressed in an interface definition language (IDL language, see col.2 lines 24-46), wherein the interface definition language is operable to define object interfaces across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (see abstract, fig.1, col.2 line 24-64 and col.4 line 33 to col.5 line 43).

Sending the request for type information to an object request broker (208 fig.2) and a metadata gateway (218 fig2) receiving the request for type information from the object request broker (see col.5 line 36 to col.6 line 40).

reading the type information from a metadata repository, wherein the type information is stored in a database format in the metadata repository (database 224 fig.2) (see fig.2, col.6 line 41 to col.7 line 63).

translating the type information from the database format to the interface definition language (see fig.5 and col.7 line 14 to col.8 line 67 and col.10 lines 5-54).

The metadata gateway sending the translated type information to the object request broker and the client receiving the translated type information for the attribute or event through the object request broker, wherein the translated type information is expressed in the interface definition language (see fig.7, col.10 line 54 to col.12 line 8).

As to claims 5 and 13, Goldberg discloses sending the request for type information to an object request broker, the metadata gateway receiving the request for type information from the object request broker, the metadata gateway sending the translated type information to the object request broker, and the client receiving the translated type information for the attribute or event through the object request broker are effected via an internet inter-object communication protocol (using query tool with information from the database, see fig.4, col.6 line 41 to col.7 line 63).

As to claim 7, Goldberg discloses the metadata gateway is implemented on a single server computer system (see fig.1).

As to claim 8, Goldberg discloses the metadata gateway is distributed over a plurality of servers, wherein each of the plurality of servers presents a substantially identical view of the metadata gateway (see fig.2 and col.5 line 6 to col.6 line 58).

As to claims 9 and 26, Goldberg discloses the interface definition language is class independent (see col.7 lines 1-50).

As to claim 10, Goldberg discloses a method for managing a network, the method comprising:

a client (104 fig.1) generating a request to encode type information for an object, attribute, or event, wherein the request is expressed in an interface definition language (IDL languages, col.2 lines 24-46), wherein the interface definition language is operable to define object interfaces across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (see abstract, fig.1, col.2 line 24-64 and col.4 line 33 to col.5 line 43).

sending the request to an object request broker (208 fig.2) and a metadata gateway (218 fig.2) receiving the request to encode the type information from the object request broker (see col.5 line 36 to col.6 line 40).

translating the type information from the interface definition language to a database format (see fig.5 and col.7 line 14 to col.8 line 67 and col.10 lines 5-54).

storing the type information in a metadata repository, wherein the type information is stored in a database format in the metadata repository (see fig.7, col.10 line 54 to col.12 line 8).

As to claim 14, Goldberg discloses a network management system comprising:

a metadata repository (406 fig.4) comprises metadata concerning object classes for a plurality of managed objects, wherein the metadata comprising information expressed in a database format, and wherein the managed objects correspond to managed devices (402, 400) on a network (see abstract, col.col.6 line 41 to col.7 line 63 and col.11 lines 7-64).

A metadata gateway (400 fig.4) which is communicatively coupled to the repository and to an object request broker, wherein the metadata gateway is operable to send and receive the metadata from the database, wherein the metadata gateway provides translation of the metadata to and from the database format and an interface definition language, wherein the interface definition language is operable to define object interfaces across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (see col.2 lines 24-64, col.7 line 14 to col.8 line 67 and col.17 line 29 to col.18 line 63).

As to claims 18-19 and 21, Goldberg discloses plurality of object types is a programming-language independent and platform independent interface including CORBA objects and COBRA ORB (see col.6 line 41 to col.7 line 14).

As to claim 20, Goldberg discloses the object request broker is configurable to be accessed by a plurality of network management clients to obtain the metadata as expressed in the generic interface (see fig.5 and col.7 line 14 to col.8 line 67).

As to claim 22, Goldberg discloses a carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement:

a metadata gateway (218 fig.2) receiving a request for type information from an object request broker (208 fig.2) (see abstract, col.5 line 36 to col.6 line 40).

reading the type information from a metadata repository, wherein the type information is stored in a database format in the metadata repository (see fig.2, col.6 line 41 to col.7 line 63).

translating the type information from the database format to an interface definition language and using the metadata gateway sending the translated type information to the object request broker (see fig.7, col.10 line 54 to col.12 line 8).

As to claim 27, Goldberg discloses a carrier medium comprising program instructions which are computer executable to implement:

a metadata gateway receiving a request to encode type information from an object request broker (see abstract, col.5 line 36 to col.6 line 40).

translating the type information from an interface definition language to a database format (see fig.2, col.6 line 41 to col.7 line 63).

storing the type information in a metadata repository, wherein the type information is stored in a database format in the metadata repository (see fig.7, col.10 line 54 to col.12 line 8).

As to claim 15 and 16, Glodberg discloses a telephone system and a network switch (see fig.8 and col.12 line 9 to col.13 line 46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 2-4, 6, 11, 12, 17, 23-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg US pat. No.6,496,833 in view of Kulkarni et al US pat. No.5,848,243.

As to claims 2-4, 6, 17, 23-25 and 28-30, Goldberg's teachings still applied as in claim 1 above. Goldberg further discloses translating data type from the data base format (see col.11 line 44 to col.12 line 61). Goldberg does not specifically discloses translating the type information from the database format to an abstract syntax notation and ASN1, and then translating the type information from the abstract syntax notation to the interface definition language. However, Kulkarni discloses using different data formats with the use of an abstract syntax notation including ASN1 (see abstract, col.6 lines 20-43). IIOP is very familiar to Database manegemnent system language. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use either of the above database language depending on the choice of implementation, and still achieve same end results.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 2 and 4 respectively.

Additional References

8. The following references are cited by the examiner as of general interest.

a. Baudoin, US pat. No.5,406,557.

b. Brunson, US pat. No.5,647,002.

c. Hellgren et al., US pat. No.6,023,579.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for this group are:

After Final: (703) 746-7239

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/ Draft: (703) 746-7240

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to response within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S. C . Sect. 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2155
March 21,2003

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100